

IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Section
1000 East Grand—Des Moines, Iowa 50319
DECISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
68-0157 (7-97) – 3091078 - EI

CLIFFORD J UTLEY
601 ARMY POST RD LOT 27
DES MOINES IA 50315

WAL-MART STORES INC
C/O THE FRICK COMPANY-UC EXPRESS
PO BOX 283
ST LOUIS MO 63166-0283

Appeal Number: 05A-UI-02587-BT
OC: 02/06/05 R: 02
Claimant: Respondent (2)

This Decision Shall Become Final, unless within fifteen (15) days from the date below, you or any interested party appeal to the Employment Appeal Board by submitting either a signed letter or a signed written Notice of Appeal, directly to the **Employment Appeal Board, 4th Floor—Lucas Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319.**

The appeal period will be extended to the next business day if the last day to appeal falls on a weekend or a legal holiday.

STATE CLEARLY

1. The name, address and social security number of the claimant.
2. A reference to the decision from which the appeal is taken.
3. That an appeal from such decision is being made and such appeal is signed.
4. The grounds upon which such appeal is based.

YOU MAY REPRESENT yourself in this appeal or you may obtain a lawyer or other interested party to do so provided there is no expense to Workforce Development. If you wish to be represented by a lawyer, you may obtain the services of either a private attorney or one whose services are paid for with public funds. It is important that you file your claim as directed, while this appeal is pending, to protect your continuing right to benefits.

(Administrative Law Judge)

(Decision Dated & Mailed)

Section 96.5-2-a - Discharge for Misconduct
Section 96.3-7 - Overpayment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (employer) appealed an unemployment insurance decision dated March 3, 2005, reference 01, which held that Clifford Utley (claimant) was eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. After hearing notices were mailed to the parties' last-known addresses of record, a telephone hearing was held on March 30, 2005. The claimant participated in the hearing. The employer participated through Brandon Stucki, District Loss Prevention Supervisor. Employer's Exhibit One was admitted into evidence.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The administrative law judge, having heard the testimony and considered all of the evidence in the record, finds that: The claimant was employed as a full-time overnight maintenance associate from August 30, 2000 through February 4, 2005. He was discharged when it was discovered he had falsified his employment application by denying a felony conviction and certifying that the information was true. The claimant was convicted of indecent contact with a minor and is a registered sex offender. The employment application advises applicants that termination will occur if hired and it is later determined the employee has falsified information on the employment application. A criminal background check was not done at the time of hire. The evidence demonstrates the employer randomly goes through employee applications verifying background information and this is how the information was discovered. Upon learning of the information, the employer met with the claimant who admitted he had provided false information on his employment application. He denied the felony conviction because he knew he would not be hired if he was truthful.

The claimant filed a claim for unemployment insurance benefits effective March 3, 2005 and has received benefits after the separation from employment in the amount of \$1,470.00.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The issue is whether the employer discharged the claimant for work-connected misconduct. A claimant is not qualified to receive unemployment insurance benefits if an employer has discharged the claimant for reasons constituting work-connected misconduct. Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a.

Iowa Code section 96.5-2-a provides:

An individual shall be disqualified for benefits:

2. Discharge for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The individual shall be disqualified for benefits until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

871 IAC 24.32(1)a provides:

Discharge for misconduct.

(1) Definition.

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's

duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. Huntoon v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 275 N.W.2d 445, 448 (Iowa 1979).

The employer has the burden to prove the claimant was discharged for work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law. Cosper v. Iowa Department of Job Service, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982). The claimant was discharged for providing false information on his employment application. When a person willfully and deliberately makes a false statement on an employment application, such falsification shall be an act of misconduct in connection with the employer. The statement need not be written and an omission of a pertinent fact would have the same effect. The falsification must be such that it does or could result in endangering the health, safety or morals of the applicant or others, or result in exposing the employer to legal liabilities or penalties, or result in placing the employer in jeopardy. 871 IAC 24.32(6). The Iowa Supreme Court has stated that a misrepresentation on a job application must be materially related to job performance to disqualify a claimant from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Larson v. Employment Appeal Board, 474 N.W.2d 570, 571 (Iowa 1991). While this statement is dicta since the court ultimately decided Larson was discharged for incompetence not her deceit on her application, the reasoning is persuasive. The court does not define materiality but cites Independent School Dist. v. Hansen, 412 N.W.2d 320, 323 (Minn. App. 1987), which states a misrepresentation is not material if a truthful answer would not have prevented the person from being hired.

In the case herein, while the employer's witness could not unequivocally state that the claimant would not have been hired since he is not personally involved in the hiring process, he did testify it was unlikely the claimant would have been hired if his criminal conviction was known. The claimant testified the individual hiring him did know about his conviction but that cannot be affirmatively established and does not explain why the claimant would not be truthful on his employment application. The claimant freely admitted he did not provide this information on his application because he knew he would not have been hired. Having a registered sex offender on staff could result in endangering the health, safety or morals of others and could also result in extensive legal liability to the employer if the claimant committed a similar act as that which resulted in his conviction.

The last issue to be addressed is whether the claimant was discharged for a past act. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge for misconduct cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act. 871 IAC 24.32(8). The act in question did occur several years earlier but the employer was not aware of it at the time. Since the employer acted promptly upon discovering the information, the delay is reasonable. Work-connected misconduct as defined by the unemployment insurance law has been established in this case and benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.3-7 provides:

7. Recovery of overpayment of benefits. If an individual receives benefits for which the individual is subsequently determined to be ineligible, even though the individual acts in good faith and is not otherwise at fault, the benefits shall be recovered. The department in its discretion may recover the overpayment of benefits either by having a sum equal to the overpayment deducted from any future benefits payable to the individual or by having the individual pay to the department a sum equal to the overpayment.

If the department determines that an overpayment has been made, the charge for the overpayment against the employer's account shall be removed and the account shall be credited with an amount equal to the overpayment from the unemployment compensation trust fund and this credit shall include both contributory and reimbursable employers, notwithstanding section 96.8, subsection 5.

Because the claimant's separation was disqualifying, benefits were paid to which the claimant was not entitled. Those benefits must be recovered in accordance with the provisions of Iowa law.

DECISION:

The unemployment insurance decision dated March 3, 2005, reference 01, is reversed. The claimant is not eligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits because he was discharged from work for misconduct. Benefits are withheld until he has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times his weekly benefit amount, provided he is otherwise eligible. The claimant is overpaid benefits in the amount of \$1,470.00.

sdb/tjc